

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 11-19, 24-30, 35-43, 48-53, and 58 are now pending in the application. By this paper, Claims 25 and 36 have been amended. The basis for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

## **ELECTION OF SPECIES**

Based on Applicants' paper filed December 22, 2005, Claims 7-10, 20-23, 31-34, 44-47, and 54-57 are believed to be withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected species. However, the Examiner indicates that Claim 20 is allowable and does not list Claims 55-57 as being withdrawn in the Office Action Summary. Because Claim 20 and Claims 55-57 were withdrawn in Applicants' paper filed December 22, 2005, Applicants assume that the allowance of Claim 20 and omission of Claims 55-57 from the Office Action Summary were in error.

## **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Applicants have amended independent Claims 25 and 36 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Claim 25 has been amended to recite that the first scroll compressor is disposed within the "outer shell" of the compressor, rather than being

disposed within the "central shell" of the outer shell. While at least a portion of the first scroll compressor is disposed within the central shell, Applicants have amended Claim 25 to more broadly state that the first scroll compressor is disposed within the outer shell, rather than limiting the first scroll compressor to being disposed within the central shell. Accordingly, this amendment broadens the scope of the claim.

Claim 36 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Specifically, the term "driving" has been replaced with the term "driven." This amendment does not narrow the scope of the claim.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 25-30, 36, 37, and 39-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rajendran et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,672,846). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Rajendran fails to teach a scroll machine having an outer shell defining a central shell and a suction duct that is spaced apart from the central shell. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Rajendran fails to teach a scroll machine having a common oil pump that supplies lubricating oil to first and second scroll compressors through passage defined by a drive shaft of the scroll machine.

Rajendran discloses a plural compressor (10) having a shell (12) and a suction inlet fitting (18). See Rajendran at Col. 2, Ins. 56-67, and Figure 1. The suction inlet

fitting is fluidly coupled to a central portion of the shell of the compressor and, therefore, is not "spaced from" the central portion of the compressor shell. Applicants respectfully submit that the suction inlet fitting of Rajendran cannot be fluidly coupled to a central portion of a compressor shell and at the same time be spaced from such central portion.

Rajendran also teaches a pair of oil pumps (36) disposed on opposite ends of a crankshaft (30) for supplying lubricating oil to moving components of the compressor. See Rajendran at Col. 3, Ins. 9-14, and Figure 1. The oil pumps respectively supply each end of the compressor with lubricating oil via a pair of bores (38, 40) formed on each end of the crankshaft. See Rajendran at Col. 3, Ins. 9-14, and Figure 1. In this manner, Rajendran fails to teach a *single* oil pump that supplies lubricating oil to first and second scroll compressors through a passage defined within a drive shaft. Rather, Rajendran discloses a *pair* of oil pumps that supply lubricating oil to individual compressor units disposed within the shell of the compressor through individual passages located at opposite ends of the crankshaft.

In contrast, independent Claim 25 recites a scroll machine having an outer shell defining a central shell and a suction duct spaced apart from the central shell. Independent Claim 36 recites a scroll machine including an oil pump driven by a drive shaft that provides lubricating oil to first and second scroll compressors through a passage defined by the drive shaft.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 25 and 36, as well as Claims 26-30, 37, and 39-43, respectively dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 35 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajendran et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 25 and 36 are believed to be in condition for allowance in light of the foregoing remarks. Because Claims 35 and 48 respectively depend from independent Claims 25 and 36, Claims 35 and 48 are similarly believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicants acknowledge the allowance of Claims 1-6, 11, 12-20, 24, 49-53, and 58. As noted above, Applicants have withdrawn Claim 20 as being directed to a non-elected species and assume that Claim 20 was allowed in error.

Applicants have chosen not to amend independent Claim 36 to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 38, as independent Claim 36 is believed to be in condition for allowance in light of the foregoing remarks.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
Michael Malinzak, Reg. No. 43,770

Dated: June 16, 2006

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MM:MHSA:ca